



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ORIGIN OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.

THE great importance, for Biblical science, of the questions concerned with the origin and signification of the Tetragrammaton is not likely to be contested. At the same time, that these questions present great and peculiar difficulties may be conceded. The time has passed when Hebrew could be regarded as the original language divinely formed for the use of man, and when it could be maintained that the first employment of the Tetragrammaton occurred under the circumstances mentioned in the first verse of the fourth chapter of Genesis. If, however, putting aside this view, we could on other grounds determine the time when this divine name came into existence, it might aid us greatly in other branches of our present inquiry. The form "Jehovah," it may be said with some confidence, does not represent the true pronunciation of the name. Still this form has been sanctioned by long-continued use, and it may be regarded as possessing a kind of neutrality. Under these circumstances it may be employed in the present article.

There are two passages in the Pentateuch, one in Genesis and the other in Exodus, which seem clearly to point to the name Jehovah being of later introduction than Elohim or El Shaddai. The first of these passages is Gen. iv. 26, "And to Seth, to him also was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then they began to call upon the name of Jehovah." This statement concerning the "calling upon the name of Jehovah" must be considered in connexion with the remarkable fact that, in the colloquy between

Eve and the Serpent, both are represented as using, not Jehovah, or Jehovah-Elohim, but Elohim only, as though the *divine* name Jehovah were not yet employed. Its occurrence in Gen. iv. 1 must be otherwise explained. So at least it has long appeared to me. The passage in Exodus is of course vi. 2, 3, where, contrasting with the revelation of himself to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai, God declares his name Jehovah. If the now prevalent opinion, which assigns the last-cited passage to the Priestly codex, be accepted, though it may give some evidence as to the later introduction of the name Jehovah, it can scarcely aid in determining the time when this introduction occurred. But, with regard to the passage in Genesis, whatever view we may take as to its historicity, if we look upon it as contained in the Jehovistic document—a document distinguished by its use of the name with which we are now concerned—if we could accurately determine the date of this document, we should have a point of advantage from which to prosecute further research. But on this matter critical opinion is by no means agreed. With regard to the date, Professor Estlin Carpenter observes, in his recently published Introduction to the *Hexateuch*, “Its production must therefore be fixed in the interval between David and Solomon on the one hand and Josiah and the book of Deuteronomy on the other.” And, after referring to the evidence furnished by compounded proper names, Professor Carpenter continues, “Only with the time of David do names compounded with Yahweh begin to occur more freely. May it not be inferred that a construction of the world’s history which regards this divine name as a universal possession of the human race from the first days cannot have been framed till the name had been for some time commonly employed in Israel?” (*The Hexateuch*, vol. I, p. 107). Moreover the place where the Jehovist wrote is not unimportant for our inquiry. In favour of this place being Judah, the writer from whom I have just quoted says, “For the southern

kingdom a long catena of opinions might easily be cited. Starting from Ewald, this view might be traced through Dillmann on the one hand and Wellhausen and Stade on the other. It is supported by a large consensus of scholars, among whom it is sufficient to mention, as representatives of different lands, Budde, Cornill, and Kittel in Germany, Wildeboer in Holland, Driver in this country, and Bacon in America" (op. cit., p. 105). What has just been said brings us somewhat near to the opinion that the name Jehovah was introduced in the time of David or even by David. Such an opinion presents, however, some difficulty. Putting aside certain proper names, there is the seemingly emphatic use of the name in the Song of Deborah, which it is not easy to regard as of late origin, though this opinion has not entirely lacked support. There is, however, a possibility which should not be altogether overlooked, namely, that the name may have been long known before it was extensively or generally used, this more general use having been the result of special circumstances.

Again; if we could definitely ascertain the date of the Books of Samuel, this result would be important for our inquiry, especially with reference to the combination יהוה צבאות "Jehovah of hosts," of which I shall have more to say in the sequel—this combination occurring for the first time in Samuel. At least, it is not found in the Pentateuch, or in Joshua, or Judges. The combination may be said to occur for the first time in Samuel, with reference to the usual order of the books, and without asserting anything as to the dates respectively of their composition. There is not, however, a unanimity of opinion as to the time when the Books of Samuel assumed their present form; and to discuss this question here might lead us too far away from our subject.

Possibly we may obtain some aid towards determining the probable date of introduction by considering the significance of the name and its probable source. For a good while there has been a growing tendency to regard

as unsuitable the idea that the name denotes "being" or "existence," notwithstanding the argument derivable from the words of the Septuagint in Exod. iii. 14, 'Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν. There is also less reluctance than was formerly manifested to assign the name to a source external to Israel; and this, it may be said, does not necessarily imply a disposition to assign also to an external source the prophetic conception of Jehovah<sup>1</sup>. The supposition of Gesenius that the word was "one of the most remote antiquity, perhaps of the same origin as *Jovis*, *Jupiter*, and transferred from the Egyptians to the Hebrews," was not likely to conciliate assent. But a better source is found in the Sanscrit *Dyaus*, whence in all probability *Jovis* and *Jupiter* were derived. *Yahu* comes very close to *Dyaus*, the final *s* in the latter word being cast off as not radical. This word, or possibly an analogous Aryan form anterior to it, and denoting the bright sky, had apparently a very wide currency, if one may judge from the numerous related proper names and other words. Indeed, so wide was this currency that it is by no means incredible that the name may have found its way into Babylonia, whatever view may be taken of recent attempts to find traces of it in the Babylonian language. If we accept the theory that Ur, where, according to the Scriptural notices, Abraham dwelt, before, in obedience to a divine command, he migrated to Haran, was situated near the Persian Gulf, there would be little or no difficulty in the supposition that he acquired a knowledge of the name *Dyaus*, and of the nature of the god so called, through intercourse probably by sea with India or the Punjab;

<sup>1</sup> Some recent distinguished scholars have suggested a Kenite origin for the name. Mr. C. G. Montefiore, if he does not accept this suggestion, at least appears to regard it with favour, but he remarks, "It by no means follows that the Mosaic conception of Jahveh was not different from and higher than the conception of him among the Kenites; still less that the Kenites knew and worshipped no other god than Jahveh." Mr. Montefiore also observes, "The etymology put forward in the famous passage in Exodus, whereby it is connected with the verb 'to be,' is by no means above suspicion" (*Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 51, 52).

that he exchanged the ceremonies and worship of the many gods of the Chaldaeans for the worship of "one God of heaven" (Judith v. 6-9; cf. Josh. xxiv. 2, 3); and that he continued the service of the same deity on his arrival in Canaan<sup>1</sup>. But there are two matters of no small importance in relation to the name and worship of Jehovah which such a theory fails adequately to explain. There is the combination "Jehovah of hosts," and there are the "calves" or "bulls," which clearly represented Jehovah. "These," says Aaron, "are thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxxii. 4). And similarly says Jeroboam of his "two calves of gold,"—"Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings xii. 28)<sup>2</sup>. It is possible, however, retaining the same general view of the source whence the name was derived, to present an explanation which shall be free from the objections just mentioned. But this explanation should not be regarded as altogether exclusive, precluding the mere possibility of some knowledge of the name having been previously derived from another source.

Tacitus, in a passage of the *Histories* which has been a good deal discussed, gives five different accounts of the origin of the Jews (v. 2). He begins with the story that, exiled from Crete they had settled in Africa at the time when Saturn lost his sovereignty, being driven out by

<sup>1</sup> This view was set forth by the present writer in a contribution to the *Modern Review*, July, 1882, p. 608. Any theological difficulty with regard to the identification, which might present itself to some minds, was met by the suggestion that *Dyaus* was "the name by which the early Aryans recognized a Great Father of mankind dwelling in the shining heavens." Reference was also made to the fact that, according to Acts xvii. 28, the Apostle, in his speech at Athens, identified the Father of mankind with Zeus as celebrated by Greek poets.

In the following number of the *Review* appeared a contribution from Professor Sayce, who said that he was "inclined to look to the Hittites both for the origin of the God himself and of his name."

<sup>2</sup> Stade observes (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vol. I, p. 466), "Verächtlich nennen die Propheten sie Kälber, auch Kalben, Hos. x. 5. Sie waren jedenfalls schon wegen der Kostbarkeit des Materials nur von geringer Grösse."

Jupiter<sup>1</sup>. It has been thought that in what is thus said by Tacitus there is a confusion between the Jews and Philistines, of whom the latter, according to the Biblical passages, Jer. xlvii. 4, Amos ix. 7, came to Palestine from Caphtor; and there seems a preponderance of opinion in favour of the position that Caphtor is to be identified with Crete. This latter view, if accepted, would be not without importance for our inquiry. But, apart from this, it can scarcely be incredible that, in a general Semitic migration towards the west, a part of the migrants may have gone on to Crete, and then have passed southward to Africa and thence to Palestine.

Among the Cretan deities pre-eminence must be given to Zeus, concerning whom the mythology alleges various well-known particulars which need not be here detailed. Whether the original Cretan name of the god was Zeus or some other name approaching nearer to the original Dyaus it is not possible for us to say. We may employ provisionally the name Zeus. The recent researches of Messrs. Evans and Hogarth, which have unveiled the supposed palace of Minos, and shrine of the Cretan Zeus, have brought to light interesting particulars with regard to this deity. He was "a man of war," the god of the double axe. But, what is for our present purpose particularly important is, that this reputed sanctuary and shrine of the Cretan deity has its walls adorned with "great figures of bulls in fresco and relief." This fact is important, though no doubt bulls were associated also with other deities. But

<sup>1</sup> "Iudaeos Creta insula profugos, novissima Libyae insedissee, memorant, qua tempestate Saturnus, vi Iovis pulsus, cesserit regnis; . . . Sunt qui tradant, Assyrios convenas, indigum agrorum populum, parte Aegypti potitos, mox proprias urbes Hebraeasque terras et propiora Syriae coluisse rura." The last mentioned (fourth) explanation might be regarded as a distorted version of the Biblical narratives concerning the journeys of Abraham, the migration to Egypt, and the Exodus. With respect to the etymology of *Iudaei*, it may be said that we may be somewhat uncertain as to the derivation of *Judah*, without accepting the view given by Tacitus, connecting the word with Mount Ida and *Idaei*.

it gives us a particular which was elsewhere lacking. And of course it must be considered in connexion with the story of Zeus assuming the form of a bull, and bearing Europa from Sidon to Crete. At least, if there is no insuperable difficulty in other respects, any objection based on the fact that Jehovah was represented in the shape of a calf or bull passes away.

The question which relates to the combination יהוה צבאות "Jehovah of hosts" is perhaps of greater importance. As to what is meant by the "hosts" two alleged significations may be mentioned, (1) that the armies of Israel are intended, or (2) that the reference is to the heavenly hosts, the stars and angels<sup>1</sup>. And certainly, in Job xxxviii. 7, the stars of the morning and the sons of God are linked together as exulting over the work of creation. The designation is one of supreme dignity, which could scarcely be the case if the armies of Israel were intended. And it seems certain that in various places the sacred writers could not possibly have had any such conception of the "hosts" before their minds. Take, as an example, the first occurrence of "Jehovah of hosts" in Isaiah (i. 9), "If Jehovah of hosts had not left us a remnant, we should have been, within a little, like Sodom, and like unto Gomorrah." Or compare the employment of the word "hosts" in Amos v. 14, 15, 16. Some difficulty has also been felt with respect to the proper name יהוה being placed in the construct state before a genitive; and certain geographical proper names which are adduced in *Kautzsch's Gesenius's Gram.* (Eng. Trans., p. 423) cannot be regarded as strictly parallel. The occasional insertion of אלהי between יהוה and צבאות may be regarded as an explanatory addition, softening a somewhat harsh and unusual construction. Grammatically יהוה might be taken as included among the צבאות, like נבירי השערים "the chief among the porters" (1 Chr. ix. 26), or אור כשדים 'Ur

<sup>1</sup> Stade observes that, so far as we know, it was the universal belief of the Semites that the stars were inhabited and inspired by spirits (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vol. I, p. 437).



among the Chaldees." If, however, we take *יהוה צבאות* as being, what it in all probability is, a translation of the designation of the Cretan deity *Zeus 'Astrépios*<sup>1</sup>, little or no difficulty remains. There was in Hebrew no adjective which could be employed to represent *ἀστέριος*, and *נוכבים* would have been unsuitable if the sun was to be included. It may be fairly said, I think, that *צבאות* was the only word which could be employed.

An objection to what has been said may, however, be based on the considerable distance which separated Crete from the land of Israel. But such an objection may be very satisfactorily answered, and it may be shown that Crete and Israel were, so to speak, brought into close contiguity.

There is, and has long been, in the British Museum a remarkable small silver coin, which has been spoken of as "the Jehovah coin." It appears in a printed catalogue of the date 1814; and it is said that it may have been acquired fifty years before. The date assigned to the coin,



on the ground of its workmanship, is *circa* 400 B. C., and it is referred also to Gaza as probably belonging to the coinage of that city. It bears on the one side (technically called the obverse) a head wearing a helmet, but with a face, notwithstanding this military accoutrement, apparently mild and benign. On the other side (the reverse) is a

<sup>1</sup> "So wurde in Gortys ein Zeus 'Astrépios d. h. als Herr des gestirnten Himmels und der Sonne verehrt" (Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, 1894, bearb. v. Robert, p. 136). 'Astrépios is registered among the "sichere Cult-Beinamen." This statement receives corroboration from Gortynian coins, on which radiant stars may be detected. See Overbeck's *Kunstmythologie*, vol. II, Münztafel VI, fig. 11, and the illustrations to Svoronos's *Numismatique de la Crète Ancienne*, Planche XVI.

figure seated on what no doubt represents a chariot, though only one winged wheel is visible. This figure is easily identified with Zeus, and he bears on his hand a bird which, judging from its comparative size, must be regarded as the eagle, the bird of Zeus. Above the figure are three Phoenician characters corresponding to יהו. There is, besides, on the reverse a bearded head or face, which has been thought to be a mask, and which, like the helmeted head, probably represents a different character of the deity. M. Babelon, the distinguished numismatist of the Bibliothèque Nationale, says of this coin:—

“Au revers, on lit le mot יהו, *Jahou*, 'Iaó, et c'est par conséquent ce dieu solaire d'origine chaldéenne que nous voyons assis sur un char dont la roue ailée symbolise la course du soleil.

“J'incline à croire que cette curieuse drachme a été frappée dans le pays des Philistins . . . Gaza est sûrement un atelier monétaire très actif: son commerce florissant l'exige.” (Introduction to *Les Perses Achéménides*, &c., p. lxvi.)

In the absence of vowel-points, it is impossible to say whether the pronunciation of the three letters should be *Yahu* or *Yehu*. No doubt Macrobius, in accordance with his theory, makes 'Iaó a solar deity. And if the deity on the coin were supposed to be solar, it would still not be altogether easy to distinguish him from Zeus, the god of the sky, especially the bright sky. If Helios is all-seeing πανόπτης so also is Zeus (see Preller's *Register der Beinamen*). If the winged chariot suits the swift course of the sun, it should not be forgotten that Zeus requires swiftness, having in his palace Pegasus, the winged steed of Belerophon, to bear his thunder and lightning (cf. Hesiod, *Theog.*, 281 sqq.<sup>1</sup>). The three Phoenician letters may stand instead of “Jehovah,” or may be essentially equivalent to “Dyaus” or “Zeus,” though we cannot tell precisely how

<sup>1</sup> But an excellent example of the winged chariot of Zeus is to be found in Plato's *Phaedrus*, 246 *sub finem*, ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ἐλαύνων πτηγὸν ἄρμα, κ.τ.λ.

the letters would have been pronounced. The three letters may be regarded as reminiscent of a time prior to the full development of the quadriliteral יהוה. It may be added that it is in accordance with a well-known law that a name imported from abroad should in time assume the garb of a normal grammatical form. Gaza is a city which, we may well believe, was in active communication with Crete; and the probability that the coin we have been discussing was stamped at Gaza marks a very important step in our investigation<sup>1</sup>.

The coin with the three letters is unique; but there is another coin of Gaza in the British Museum, of very considerable importance for our subject, and of which there are probably other examples elsewhere. This coin is one of Hadrian's, and bears his effigy. On the reverse is what was no doubt intended to represent a temple, having in it two figures, possibly deities. On the one side of the temple is to be seen, in Greek letters, the name Gaza, on the other, also in Greek letters, the word *Marna*. Further information with regard to *Marna* is given by Stephen of Byzantium, in his *De Urbibus*, and by Mark, deacon of Gaza, in his life of Bishop Porphyry. The former says of

<sup>1</sup> There is an important note by Colonel Conder in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1882 (p. 147), on "The Gaza Jupiter." He says, "This great statue," removed to Constantinople, "was discovered, in 1880, by the natives at Tell 'Ajjûl, south of Gaza." "There can, I imagine, be little doubt that the figure is intended for a Jupiter. The principal deity of Gaza was called Marna (i. e. מרנא 'our Lord'), and was worshipped as late as the fifth century A. D. (Epiphanius Adv. Haeret.)." As to the identification with Jupiter, Colonel Conder relied especially on the arrangement of the hair, the nose and face having been damaged, while the arms have in great part disappeared. Colonel Conder adds that "a curious tradition of buried treasure, and of a phantom calf which guards it, exists at Tell 'Ajjûl ('the calf's mound')." This close juxtaposition of a statue of Jupiter with "the calf," is, for our present subject, very noteworthy. Colonel Conder considered that "excavations should certainly be made at Tell 'Ajjûl"; but, so far as I know, this has not been done.

Of the statue Professor G. A. Smith also says that "it bears resemblance to the Greek face of the Father of gods and men" (*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 188).

Gaza that it had a temple of the Cretan Zeus, whom they called Marnes, which is to be interpreted "of Cretan origin" (Κρηταγενῆ). Mark, the Gazaeon deacon, says the temple was called the Marnion, and was regarded as the most splendid temple in existence. The transformation of *Marna* into *Marnes*, or *Marnas*, as a Greek proper name need not detain us. Stark, in his *Gaza* (p. 577), rightly compares *Marna* with the *Maran* in *Mapavaθά*, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 22. But there is no reason for suggesting that this *Mapav* is an abbreviated form. It is simply the Syriac ܡܪܢܐ "our Lord"; and *Marna* (ܡܪܢܐ) is Chaldee, with the same meaning. In the mouth of the Cretans, claiming Zeus as *their* Lord, he would naturally be designated "*our* Lord." Thus we may explain the word Κρηταγενῆ. Some fifty or sixty years ago Hitzig attempted (*Urgeschichte etc. der Philist.*) to give the word *Marna* a Sanscrit origin, and to identify the god so called with Dagon. But the attempt would seem to have attained little or no success. Dagon, as god of fish and fisheries, may very well have been worshipped on the east coast of the Mediterranean, even before the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor. Dagon's principal sanctuary was probably at Ashdod, but, though he was certainly not Marna, there is no reason to deny that he may have had a temple also at Gaza, cp. Judg. xvi. 23. According to Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 11, § 4) Gaza became a Greek city, and thus *Marna*, as a Chaldee word, is remarkable, as possessing, in all probability, no slight antiquity. Moreover it brings Zeus into connexion with Semitism, and Semitism into connexion with Crete<sup>1</sup> and Gaza. And we have thus a probable reason for connecting also with Crete and Gaza the "Jehovah coin," with its Phoenician letters.

It is not unimportant for us that Gaza was assigned to Judah, and, according to the Hebrew text of Judg. i. 18,

<sup>1</sup> I may append the remark that this indication of Semitism may possibly prove important by-and-by with respect to the numerous inscriptions which Mr. Evans has discovered in Crete.

Judah conquered and possessed the city, at least for a time. This statement, considering the context, is not without difficulty; but, for the same reason, the rendering of the Septuagint text, *καὶ οὐκ ἐκληρονόμησεν Ἰούδας τὴν Γάζαν*, seems open to still more serious objection. But, whatever opinion may be formed concerning this passage, we have the fact that, by reason of contiguity, Gaza was a city influence emanating from which was not unlikely to affect Judah. As to the period in the history of Israel when such influence was most likely to be exerted there would probably be a pretty general consensus of opinion. It was David who engaged in the service of the Philistines under Achish, and who received as the reward for his service and support the city of Ziklag. It was David who was probably, during the earlier part of his reign, a vassal of the Philistines. It was he who had in specially close attendance the "Cherethite and Pelethite," names which have been taken, not unreasonably, to denote "Cretans and Philistines"; though, on this view, the latter word would seem to have lost the *Ϝ*, probably through a local difficulty of pronunciation. It was in Ittai the Gittite that David found a specially attached and devoted follower and friend, with whom it would appear that there were other "strangers and exiles" (cf. 2 Sam. xv. 18 sqq.). All this tends to lessen or remove the difficulty which would otherwise present itself as to David's introducing a foreign name into Israel, or to his regarding with special favour such a name previously introduced. We become also disposed to regard to a great extent favourably the position that "Jehovah" was a name of God belonging more particularly to Judah; and we can approve the assertion that the Jehovist was a writer of Judæan origin.

Into the question of the compounded proper names I forbear to enter. This would require a separate article; and we should probably not come to results entirely satisfactory and decisive.

So also it is beyond my present purpose to treat of the

history of the Tetragrammaton. I may observe, however, that Rashi, commenting on the famous words of Exod. iii. 14, **אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה**, spoke of them as a promise that God would be with his people in the distress then present as he would be with them in distresses of the future. If this view is accepted **יְהוָה** itself, also, must have, it would seem, a future signification. There are indications, I think, that the name was so regarded—that is as future—in ancient times, especially, perhaps, in promises of deliverance to be found in the so-called Second Isaiah. This would be in accord with Rashi's exegesis just mentioned.

If it should be said that this article does not give a demonstration concerning the origin of the Tetragrammaton, and that the results set forth are at best only probable, this may be allowed, while the cogency of the evidence in some particulars must be maintained; and with regard to some points, as critical science advances, greater definiteness and precision may be attained.

THOMAS TYLER.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON THE GAZAEAN GOD MARNA.

From LENORMANT.

“ Mais le récit sur la statue de Hobal est surtout à comparer à ce que dit du fameux dieu de Gaza, Marnas, **מָרְנָא**, ‘notre seigneur’ (sur ce dieu voy. encore : Marin. *Vit. Procl.* 19; Lamprid. *Alex. Sev.* 17; Steph. Byz. vº. Γάζα; S. Epiphan. *Adv. haeres.* p. 518; S. Hieronym. *Comment. in Ies.* XVII, Opp. omn. t. III, p. 175; *Vit. Hilarion.* Opp. t. IV, part. II, pp. 78 et 80; *Epist. ad Laetam*, Opp. t. IV, part. II, p. 591; Eckhel, *Doctr. num. vet.* t. III, p. 449), le diacre Marc, dans la vie de St. Porphyre, évêque de Gaza (Bolland. *Act. Sanctor. Februar.* t. III, p. 648): *Accidit autem, ut illo anno esset siccitas et defectus pluviae. Cives vero omnes id adscribebant ingressui Beati Porphyrii, dicentes: Nobis responsum dedit Marna, fore ut Porphyrius esset auctor malorum civitati. Cum autem pergeret Deus non pluere primo mense qui ab eis*

vocatur Dios, deinde etiam secundo qui dicitur Epilleos omnes affligebantur. Congregati autem idololatrae in Marnaeo, multa sacrificia et multas preces faciebant ea de causa. Dicebant enim MARNAM ESSE DOMINUM IMBRIUM. Marnam vero dicunt esse Iovem. Cum autem perseverassent septem dies hymnos dicentes, et egredientes extra civitatem in locum qui vocatur orationis, animum despondentes, reversi sunt ad sua opera, nulla re effecta. Or les Grecs ont constamment proclamé l'identité du Marna de Gaza et du Zeus Crétois, c'est à dire du Zeus resté le plus exactement conforme à son type primitif du dieu-Ciel (Maury, *Histoire des religions de la Grèce*, t. I, pp. 52-64), au type du Dyâus védique (A. Weber, *Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte*, p. 35; Max Müller, *Leçons sur la science du langage*, p. 12 de la traduction Harris et Perrot), comme le prouve son surnom d'Astérios (Apollodor. III. 1, 3; Pausan. II. 31, 1; Lycophr. *Alexandr.* v. 1301; Tzetz. *Antehomer.* vv. 99-101; *Chiliad.* I. v. 473). Du reste, le caractère cosmique et essentiellement uranique de Marna ressort nettement, comme l'a vu Movers (*Die Phönizier*, t. I, p. 663), de sa position à la tête d'une ogdoade de divinités, qui en fait le correspondant exact du Eschmoun phénicien: *Erant autem in civitate simulacrorum publica templa octo: nempe Solis et Veneris et Apollinis et Proserpinae et Hecates, et quod dicebatur Hierion seu sacerdotum, et Fortunae civitatis, quod vocabant Tycheon, et Marnion, quod dicebant esse Cretigenae* (je corrige ainsi au lieu de la leçon *Critae generis* du texte des Bollandistes) *Iovis: quod existimabant esse gloriosius omnibus templis quae sunt ubique* (Marc. Diacon. *Vit. S. Porphy.* Gaz. 9; *Act. Sanctor. Februar.* t. III, p. 655). Il est également indiqué par la forme ronde de son temple, forme symbolique donnée chez les payens de Harrân au temple de la Cause première et au temple de l'ordonnance du monde, κόσμος (Dimeschyî, dans Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, t. II, pp. 381 et 382): *Erat enim (templum) formae rotundae circumdatum duabus porticibus, se invicem interius subeuntibus* (Marc. Diacon. *Vit. S. Porphy.* Gaz. 10; *Act. Sanctor. Februar.* t. III, p. 657).—*Lettres Assyriologiques, Première Série*, vol. II, pp. 165 sqq.